

XXXVII CONGRESS.
FIRST SESSION.

SENATE.—WASHINGTON, May 9, 1862.

Mr. BAYARD (Dem., Del.) presented a petition for equal privileges to all the Free men in the country.

Mr. BROWNING (Rep., Ill.) presented a petition for a ship canal from Lake Michigan to the Mississippi River.

Mr. CHANDLER (Rep., Mich.), from the Committee on Commerce, reported the House Bill relating to the better protection of revenue.

The bill authorizes the President to refuse clearances to any vessel where he has reason to believe its cargo is intended to reach the Rebels. It also authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to prohibit the importation or transmutation on railroads of certain goods, which might in any way reach or fall into the hands of the Rebels.

Mr. WADE presented two petitions for confirmation.

Mr. SHERMAN's resolution calling for the reports of the officers commanding at the battles at Pittsburg Landing was taken up.

Mr. SHERMAN (Rep., Ohio) said that he, in common with other citizens of Ohio, was pained by the news upon certain Ohio regiments in that battle, especially by the Chicago papers, and further by the Senator from Kentucky (Powell), who was not distinguished for his sympathy with the cause. It was reported that some of the regiments had without firing a gun. He referred to the 3d regiment, who, according to all reports, fired two rounds and then retreated by order of Col. Appleby, who left and was not seen any more during the day; but the regiment rallied, and fought on Sunday and Monday. He had no desire to do my justice to Col. Appleby, but it was evident that the regiment only did what was having a full field officer. This Colonel, he understood, had been cashiered since.

In regard to the 7th Ohio Regiment, the report was all incorrect—though new troops, they fought bravely and well, notwithstanding Gen. Sherman's report was gained them. This regiment lost 23 men killed, wounded, and missing. Mr. Sherman also defended the 7th Ohio Regiment from the charge of cowards. They were all raw troops who were called upon to bear the first attack of that battle. He then referred to the conduct of other Ohio Regiments, who fought with the most determined bravery, and held their position under a severe fire from the enemy, till ordered to fall back, which they did in good order. He then spoke in terms of high praise of the German regiments. He closed by referring to what Ohio had done in the cause of the war, and the glory won by her soldiers everywhere.

Mr. POWELL (Dem., Ky.) said the Senator from Ohio (Sherman) had referred to him. He (Powell) had never said anything against the Ohio soldiers. He supposed them to be as brave as any men in the world. He had simply made a caustic remark in reply to Senator Wade, and he thought that Senator Sherman was exceedingly ungracious in referring to him (Powell) in the manner he had done, and particularly so by (Sherman's) remark about "sympathy."

Mr. HARLAN (Rep., Iowa) thought that part of the Senator's (Sherman's) speech was intended to belittle Gen. Grant. It would have a bad effect in the future. From all that he (Harlan) could learn, Gen. Grant was not fit to command a large army. Mr. Harlan read a letter from the battle-field, saying that the army was undoubtedly surprised at Pittsburg Landing; and from all that he (Harlan) could learn from the Iowa troops, he was the general opinion of the soldiers who were engaged in the fight. Mr. Harlan here sent to the Clerk's desk an article from a Missouri paper in praise of the Iowa troops. He said he did not think it proper for Senators to censure the conduct of Generals of the Army in the Senate, and he (Harlan) should have said nothing for the remarks of the Senator from Ohio (Sherman). He (Harlan) was not willing that soldiers from Iowa should be led by General Grant, but was not willing to sit still at under any attempt to belittle the character of that General.

Mr. BROWNING (Rep., Ill.) said that he had listened with pleasure to the remark of the Senator from Ohio (Sherman), but he was sorry to hear the Senator from Iowa (Harlan) make any attack on Gen. Grant. He (Browning) had seen no evidence sufficient to impeach any neglect to Gen. Grant, but he (Browning) was not defending him (Grant) because he was from Illinois. His soldiers needed no defense. He contended that Gen. Prentiss was not surprised at all. No braver man had fought in the war. He (Browning) was not in possession of facts to defend Gen. Grant from attacks arising from newspaper slanders. Certainly there was no braver man in the army.

Mr. WILSON (Rep., Mass.) said the resolution called for information, and no one would oppose it. He (Wilson) did not think it wise to discuss their operations in the field, nor the plans and military actions of Generals in the field. Better leave these operations to the press and the people. Senators have opinions of the plans and operations of military men in the field, but none of us have that knowledge which enables us to give opinions in regard to military affairs to any considerable weight in the country, people quite as well qualified to pronounce on this or any other country, the law of nations interfered with the law of the country from which it came, and the laws of the United States of government.

Mr. WICKLIFFE (Rep., Ill.) stated he understood that legal authority had been appealed to for the resolution, but the military authorities refuse to permit the law to be executed, and that the nation is not satisfied.

Mr. ARNOLD asked whether the slaves escaped from Union masters.

Mr. WICKLIFFE replied that he had been so informed. It was had been taken out and the Marshal forbidden to execute them, on the ground that the military power rules. We are under the influence of a military despotism, so far as military law is concerned.

Mr. OLIN (Rep., N. Y.) stated that the reasons he had voted against sustaining the previous question respecting compensation for slaves. He said it was, as Mr. Stevens admitted, put into the head of the latter a new idea, a round point of constitutional law, it must have felt like a mouse in a strange garret—altogether out of place. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Pennsylvania resorted to the course of ridicule and most silly sarcasm.

Without further proceedings, the House adjourned till Monday.

GRANT.—Sudden, Friday, May 9, James Crichton, in the 50th year of his age.

The funeral services will take place from the residence of her mother, No. 147 South Eighth street, Williamson, on Sunday, the 11th inst., at 2 o'clock p.m. The relatives and friends are invited to attend without further notice. Her remains will be taken to Hackensack, N. J., for interment.

COPPER.—On Friday, May 9, Mary E., wife of John R. Cooper, in the 50th year of her age.

The funeral services will take place from the residence of her mother, No. 147 South Eighth street, Williamson, on Sunday, the 11th inst., at 2 o'clock p.m. The relatives and friends are invited to attend without further notice. Her remains will be taken to Greenwood for interment.

CURCH.—In Williamson, on Friday, May 9, Margaret A. the widow of Andrew D. Church, aged 35 months and 23 days.

The friends of the family are respectfully invited to attend the funeral at the South Fifth street M. E. Church, on Sunday, May 11, at 1 o'clock p.m., without further invitation.

Penney's Funeral parlor.

GRANT.—Sudden, Friday, May 9, James Crichton, in the 50th year of his age.

The relatives and friends of the family are respectfully invited to attend the funeral at his residence, No. 249 East Broadway, on Monday morning, May 12, at 10 o'clock a.m. The remains will be taken to New York for interment on Monday morning.

OLIN.—In Brooklyn, Friday, May 9, James Crichton, in the 50th year of his age.

The relatives and friends of the family are respectfully invited to attend the funeral at his residence, No. 249 East Broadway, on Monday morning, May 12, at 10 o'clock a.m. The remains will be taken to New York for interment on Monday morning.

WICKLIFFE.—No; but the United States against England.

Mr. LOVEJOY (Rep., Ill.) stated a Louisiana slave had been involuntarily taken to France and returned in a suit for freedom. The Court decided in his favor, on the ground that whenever a master took a slave beyond the jurisdiction which recognized him as a slave, he was free, and being free, could not be re-enslaved.

Mr. OLIN responded that, according to his recollection, the gentleman had not correctly stated the article in the bill originally introduced, inquired whether Congress has power to repeal the law of nations on the high seas.

Mr. OLIN.—It has been decided that the law of nations cannot take that description of property which is recognized as such in any State of the Union.

Mr. STEVENS (Rep., Pa.) wished to reply to the question by asking whether, when a vessel sailed from this or any other country, the law of nations interfered with the law of the country from which it came, and whether the vessel is not the soil of the United States, and the laws of the United States of government.

Mr. WICKLIFFE replied—What has been adjudicated may be regarded as the law of nations. It had been decided that slaves on board vessels of the United States are protected from liberation by the local law of the country.

Mr. STEVENS—is that the Somers case?

Mr. WICKLIFFE—No; but the United States against England.

Mr. LOVEJOY (Rep., Ill.) stated a Louisiana slave had been involuntarily taken to France and returned in a suit for freedom. The Court decided in his favor, on the ground that whenever a master took a slave beyond the jurisdiction which recognized him as a slave, he was free, and being free, could not be re-enslaved.

Mr. OLIN responded that, according to his recollection, the gentleman had not correctly stated the article in the bill originally introduced, inquired whether Congress has power to repeal the law of nations on the high seas.

Mr. OLIN.—It has been decided that the law of nations cannot take that description of property which is recognized as such in any State of the Union.

Mr. STEVENS (Rep., Pa.) wished to reply to the question by asking whether, when a vessel sailed from this or any other country, the law of nations interfered with the law of the country from which it came, and whether the vessel is not the soil of the United States, and the laws of the United States of government.

Mr. WICKLIFFE replied that, according to his recollection, the gentleman had not correctly stated the article in the bill originally introduced, inquired whether Congress has power to repeal the law of nations on the high seas.

Mr. OLIN.—It has been decided that the law of nations cannot take that description of property which is recognized as such in any State of the Union.

Mr. STEVENS (Rep., Pa.) wished to reply to the question by asking whether, when a vessel sailed from this or any other country, the law of nations interfered with the law of the country from which it came, and whether the vessel is not the soil of the United States, and the laws of the United States of government.

Mr. WICKLIFFE replied that, according to his recollection, the gentleman had not correctly stated the article in the bill originally introduced, inquired whether Congress has power to repeal the law of nations on the high seas.

Mr. OLIN.—It has been decided that the law of nations cannot take that description of property which is recognized as such in any State of the Union.

Mr. STEVENS (Rep., Pa.) wished to reply to the question by asking whether, when a vessel sailed from this or any other country, the law of nations interfered with the law of the country from which it came, and whether the vessel is not the soil of the United States, and the laws of the United States of government.

Mr. WICKLIFFE replied that, according to his recollection, the gentleman had not correctly stated the article in the bill originally introduced, inquired whether Congress has power to repeal the law of nations on the high seas.

Mr. OLIN.—It has been decided that the law of nations cannot take that description of property which is recognized as such in any State of the Union.

Mr. STEVENS (Rep., Pa.) wished to reply to the question by asking whether, when a vessel sailed from this or any other country, the law of nations interfered with the law of the country from which it came, and whether the vessel is not the soil of the United States, and the laws of the United States of government.

Mr. WICKLIFFE replied that, according to his recollection, the gentleman had not correctly stated the article in the bill originally introduced, inquired whether Congress has power to repeal the law of nations on the high seas.

Mr. OLIN.—It has been decided that the law of nations cannot take that description of property which is recognized as such in any State of the Union.

Mr. STEVENS (Rep., Pa.) wished to reply to the question by asking whether, when a vessel sailed from this or any other country, the law of nations interfered with the law of the country from which it came, and whether the vessel is not the soil of the United States, and the laws of the United States of government.

Mr. WICKLIFFE replied that, according to his recollection, the gentleman had not correctly stated the article in the bill originally introduced, inquired whether Congress has power to repeal the law of nations on the high seas.

Mr. OLIN.—It has been decided that the law of nations cannot take that description of property which is recognized as such in any State of the Union.

Mr. STEVENS (Rep., Pa.) wished to reply to the question by asking whether, when a vessel sailed from this or any other country, the law of nations interfered with the law of the country from which it came, and whether the vessel is not the soil of the United States, and the laws of the United States of government.

Mr. WICKLIFFE replied that, according to his recollection, the gentleman had not correctly stated the article in the bill originally introduced, inquired whether Congress has power to repeal the law of nations on the high seas.

Mr. OLIN.—It has been decided that the law of nations cannot take that description of property which is recognized as such in any State of the Union.

Mr. STEVENS (Rep., Pa.) wished to reply to the question by asking whether, when a vessel sailed from this or any other country, the law of nations interfered with the law of the country from which it came, and whether the vessel is not the soil of the United States, and the laws of the United States of government.

Mr. WICKLIFFE replied that, according to his recollection, the gentleman had not correctly stated the article in the bill originally introduced, inquired whether Congress has power to repeal the law of nations on the high seas.

Mr. OLIN.—It has been decided that the law of nations cannot take that description of property which is recognized as such in any State of the Union.

Mr. STEVENS (Rep., Pa.) wished to reply to the question by asking whether, when a vessel sailed from this or any other country, the law of nations interfered with the law of the country from which it came, and whether the vessel is not the soil of the United States, and the laws of the United States of government.

Mr. WICKLIFFE replied that, according to his recollection, the gentleman had not correctly stated the article in the bill originally introduced, inquired whether Congress has power to repeal the law of nations on the high seas.

Mr. OLIN.—It has been decided that the law of nations cannot take that description of property which is recognized as such in any State of the Union.

Mr. STEVENS (Rep., Pa.) wished to reply to the question by asking whether, when a vessel sailed from this or any other country, the law of nations interfered with the law of the country from which it came, and whether the vessel is not the soil of the United States, and the laws of the United States of government.

Mr. WICKLIFFE replied that, according to his recollection, the gentleman had not correctly stated the article in the bill originally introduced, inquired whether Congress has power to repeal the law of nations on the high seas.

Mr. OLIN.—It has been decided that the law of nations cannot take that description of property which is recognized as such in any State of the Union.

Mr. STEVENS (Rep., Pa.) wished to reply to the question by asking whether, when a vessel sailed from this or any other country, the law of nations interfered with the law of the country from which it came, and whether the vessel is not the soil of the United States, and the laws of the United States of government.

Mr. WICKLIFFE replied that, according to his recollection, the gentleman had not correctly stated the article in the bill originally introduced, inquired whether Congress has power to repeal the law of nations on the high seas.

Mr. OLIN.—It has been decided that the law of nations cannot take that description of property which is recognized as such in any State of the Union.

Mr. STEVENS (Rep., Pa.) wished to reply to the question by asking whether, when a vessel sailed from this or any other country, the law of nations interfered with the law of the country from which it came, and whether the vessel is not the soil of the United States, and the laws of the United States of government.

Mr. WICKLIFFE replied that, according to his recollection, the gentleman had not correctly stated the article in the bill originally introduced, inquired whether Congress has power to repeal the law of nations on the high seas.

Mr. OLIN.—It has been decided that the law of nations cannot take that description of property which is recognized as such in any State of the Union.

Mr. STEVENS (Rep., Pa.) wished to reply to the question by asking whether, when a vessel sailed from this or any other country, the law of nations interfered with the law of the country from which it came, and whether the vessel is not the soil of the United States, and the laws of the United States of government.

Mr. WICKLIFFE replied that, according to his recollection, the gentleman had not correctly stated the article in the bill originally introduced, inquired whether Congress has power to repeal the law of nations on the high seas.

Mr. OLIN.—It has been decided that the law of nations cannot take that description of property which is recognized as such in any State of the Union.

Mr. STEVENS (Rep., Pa.) wished to reply to the question by asking whether, when a vessel sailed from this or any other country, the law of nations interfered with the law of the country from which it came, and whether the vessel is not the soil of the United States, and the laws of the United States of government.

Mr. WICKLIFFE replied that, according to his recollection, the gentleman had not correctly stated the article in the bill originally introduced, inquired whether Congress has power to repeal the law of nations on the high seas.

Mr. OLIN.—It has been decided that the law of nations cannot take that description of property which is recognized as such in any State of the Union.

Mr. STEVENS (Rep., Pa.) wished to reply to the question by asking whether, when a vessel sailed from this or any other country, the law of nations interfered with the law of the country from which it came, and whether the vessel is not the soil of the United States, and the laws of the United States of government.

Mr. WICKLIFFE replied that, according to his recollection, the gentleman had not correctly stated the article in the bill originally introduced, inquired whether Congress has power to repeal the law of nations on the high seas.

Mr. OLIN.—It has been decided that the law of nations cannot take that description of property which is recognized as such in any State of the Union.

Mr. STEVENS (Rep., Pa.) wished to reply to the question by asking whether, when a vessel sailed from this or any other country, the law of nations interfered with the law of the country from which it came, and whether the vessel is not the soil of the United States, and the laws of the United States of government.

Mr. WICKLIFFE replied that, according to his recollection, the gentleman had not correctly stated the article in the bill originally introduced, inquired whether Congress has power to repeal the law of nations on the high seas.

Mr. OLIN.—It has been decided that the law of nations cannot take that description of property which is recognized as such in any State of the Union.

Mr. STEVENS (Rep., Pa.) wished to reply to the question by asking whether, when a vessel sailed from this or any other country, the law of nations interfered with the law of the country from which it came, and whether the vessel is not the soil of the United States, and the laws of the United States of government.

Mr. WICKLIFFE replied that, according to his recollection, the gentleman had not correctly stated the article in the bill originally introduced, inquired whether Congress has power to repeal the law of nations on the high seas.

Mr. OLIN.—It has been decided that the law of nations cannot take that description of property which is recognized as such in any State of the Union.

Mr. STEVENS (Rep., Pa.) wished to reply to the question by asking whether, when a vessel sailed from this or any other country, the law of nations interfered with the law of the country from which it came, and whether the vessel is not the soil of the United States, and the laws of the United States of government.

Mr. WICKLIFFE replied that, according to his recollection, the gentleman had not correctly stated the article in the bill originally introduced, inquired whether Congress has power to repeal